



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

such perverted beginnings break forth. For He is near, respecting whom it is written, 'He Himself is King over all the sons of pride.'

Pope Gregory I., the immediate successor of Pelagius, is still stronger in his indignant protest against the arrogant pretensions of this same John of Constantinople, as the following extracts from four different epistles will show:—

"My fellow priest, John," says he, in his epistle addressed to the Emperor Maurice, "attempts to be called the UNIVERSAL BISHOP. I am compelled to exclaim:—Oh times! Oh manners! Priests seek to themselves names of vanity, and glory in new and profane appellations. Do I, in this matter, defend only my own proper cause? Do I vindicate an injury specially offered to myself? Do I not rather take up the cause of God omnipotent, and the cause of the Church universal? Far from the very hearts of Christians be that name of blasphemy, in which the honour of all priests is taken away, while it is madly arrogated to himself by a single individual!"

Again, in his epistle to Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, and Anastasius of Antioch, he further writes—"No one of my predecessors ever consented to use this so profane appellation; for, if a single patriarch be styled UNIVERSAL, the name of patriarch is derogated from the others. But far, very far, be it from a Christian mind that any person should wish to snatch to himself a title, whence he may seem, even in any, the very smallest degree, to diminish the honour of his brethren!"

Again, his epistle, lib. v., No. 18, to John of Constantinople himself—"What wilt thou say to Christ, the true Head of the Universal Church, in the examination of the last judgment—thou who attempted to subjugate all his members to thyself by the appellation of UNIVERSAL? In the use of so perverted a title, who, I ask, is proposed for thy imitation, save he, who, despising the legions of angels, constituted in a social equality with himself, endeavoured to break forth to the summit of an unapproached singularity?"

And in epistle 31 (lib. vii.), to the Emperor Maurice, he still more emphatically says, "I, indeed, confidently assert, that whosoever either calls himself, or desires to be called, UNIVERSAL PRIEST, that person, in his vain elation, is the precursor of Antichrist, because through his pride he exalts himself above the others."

In these strong expressions, Pope Gregory spoke of the assumption of the title as blasphemy, a token of Antichrist, &c., &c., without any exception in his own favour, or of his successors; and Roman writers have been greatly perplexed by the difficulty of maintaining the claim of subsequent Popes to a title which Gregory the Great so broadly denied; for, even if it be true that the Emperor Phocas, at the beginning of the 7th century, made a grant of universal jurisdiction to the Bishop of Rome, it is manifest that he had no power to bestow any such jurisdiction beyond the limits of his own empire, even if such a grant could have laid any satisfactory foundation for the claim of the spiritual authority now arrogated by the Roman see.

As this is an important era in ecclesiastical history, it may be worth while to briefly review the state of things at this period.

The Emperor Maurice had been favourably disposed to Gregory, and had received, in return, assurances of the highest respect. He, however, seems to have regarded with indifference the dispute between Gregory and John about the title of *Universal Bishop*, and thereby to have lost the friendship of Pope Gregory. Maurice had in his army a centurion named Phocas, a man of the lowest passions and worst character, who, taking advantage of a mutiny among the soldiers, murdered the emperor, with circumstances of the utmost atrocity, and possessed himself of the imperial throne, after putting to death ten of the imperial family, and endeavouring to cut off all whose nobility, or wisdom, or reputation had raised them above the common rank. Gregory, to his indelible disgrace, expressed the highest satisfaction, and employed the strongest terms of adulation towards the miscreant who had thus usurped the throne of his murdered master. His letter begins with, "Glory be to God on high, who, according as it is written, changes times, and transfers kingdoms," and

the like, and proceeds to represent the happy advantages the world would reap under the benign influences of his government. Perhaps he anticipated that Phocas, if flattered and supported, might not be unwilling to punish the Bishop of Constantinople for the protection he had striven to afford, during the rebellion, to the children of Maurice; and the hope of the withdrawal of the permission which the late emperor had given to the bishop of that city to bear the title of *Universal* may, perhaps, account for, though it cannot excuse or justify, the base flatteries of Gregory towards a monster who had violated every moral sanction.

The historian, Gibbon, has thus described Phocas, in terms which certainly did not exaggerate his character or vices—"Ignorant of letters, of laws, and even of arms, he indulged in the supreme rank a more ample privilege of lust and drunkenness, and his brutal pleasures were either injurious to his subjects or disgraceful to himself. Without assuming the office of a prince, he renounced the profession of a soldier; and the reign of Phocas afflicted Europe with ignominious peace and Asia with desolating war. His savage temper was inflamed by passion, hardened by fear, exasperated by resistance or reproach."

It was at the hands, however, of this tyrannical monster that the successor of Pope Gregory, Boniface III., is said to have obtained an edict commanding that the Church of Rome should be styled and esteemed the "Head of all Churches," and the Pope, "*Universal Bishop*"—the very title which his predecessors, Pelagius and Gregory, had proclaimed to be so vain, proud, profane, wicked, blasphemous, devilish, and antichristian, when claimed by their rival the bishop of the imperial city. The conduct of Pope Gregory shows the profound fear he entertained that the chief place would be transferred to the metropolis of the East, in the same way by which it came to his own, and surely not without reason. Byzantium had once been a poor suffragan bishopric, under the jurisdiction of Heraclea; when the city grew to greatness as the eastern metropolis of the empire, we have seen that the bishopric took rank next to Rome, in spite of all the remonstrances which the Bishops of old Rome could make against it, displacing all the ancient patriarchates. Alexandria in the same way preceded Antioch—on what ground it would be difficult to say, unless that it was the second chief city of the world. What was there, then, to prevent Constantinople assuming ere long the first rank, and displacing the precedence of the ancient capital of the empire itself? as some of its archbishops or patriarchs were evidently aiming to do in arrogating to themselves the exclusive title of *Universal Bishop*.

So clear is it to every well-read student in ecclesiastical history that this exclusive universal pastorage in any one bishop was not even thought of in primitive ages, that Father Newman himself, before he seceded from the Church of England—but while it must be admitted that he was not only well read in ecclesiastical history, but was not at all prejudiced against the Church of Rome—thus writes in his 7th lecture on Romanism and Protestantism (p. 217): "What there is not the shadow of a reason for saying that the fathers held, what has not the faintest pretensions of being a catholic truth, is this, that St. Peter, or his successors, were and are universal bishops; that they have the whole of Christendom for their own diocese, in a way which other Apostles and Bishops had and have not; that they are a bishop of bishops in such sense as belongs to no other bishops; in fact, that the difference between St. Peter and the popes after him, and other bishops, is not one of mere superiority and degree, but of kind; not of rank, but of class. This the Romanists hold; and they do not hold it by Catholic tradition, but by private interpretation of Scripture."

While, however, we have said enough to show that the popes had no divine or exclusive right to claim the title of *Universal Bishop*, we ought, perhaps, before leaving the subject, to remind or warn our studious readers that there is a modified, or rather a metaphorical, sense in which, long before the alleged grant of Phocas to Boniface III., not only certain Bishops of Rome, but bishops of many other principal sees, were styled "*Universal Bishops*."

We mean the sense in which the title was considered to import a general care and solicitude over all the Christian Churches. Bishop Stillingfleet has given an elaborate examination of this subject in his chapter on the title of *Universal Bishop*.^a The following passages may suffice to explain our meaning:—

"We should consider, that power and authority in the Bishop of the Church is given with an immediate respect to the good of the whole Church; so that if it were possible that every particular bishop could take care of the whole Church they have authority enough by their function to do it. But it not only being impossible that every bishop should do it, but it being inconsistent with peace and order, that all should undertake it, therefore it was necessary that there should be some bounds set, for the more convenient management of that authority which they had. From hence came the original of particular dioceses, that within such a compass they might better exercise the power which they enjoyed. As if many lights be placed in a great room, though the intention of

every one of them is to give light to the whole room, yet that this might be the better done, these lights are conveniently placed in the several parts of it. And this is what St. Cyprian means in that famous expression of his, that there is but one bishopric in the whole world, a part of which is held by every bishop; for the Church in common is designed as the diocese of all bishops, which is set out into several apartments, for the more advantageous governing of it."

He then goes on to another striking illustration of the idea he wishes to convey:—

"As a flock of many thousand sheep, being committed to the care of many shepherds, these have all an eye to the good of the whole flock, but do not, therefore, sit all together in one place to oversee it, but every one hath his share to look after, for the benefit of the whole; but yet so, that upon occasion one of them may extend his care beyond his own division, and may be very useful to the whole by counsel and direction. Thus we find it was in the primitive Church, though every bishop had his particular charge, yet still they regarded the common good of the whole Church, and upon occasion did extend their counsel and advice far beyond their particular Churches, and exercised their functions in other places besides those which the Church's convenience had allotted to them."

In this sense the title of "*Universal Bishop*" was not unfrequently applied to bishops of other distinguished sees as well as to those of Rome, without being understood to involve any superiority in power or jurisdiction over other bishops, or disparagement to the independence of the latter, beyond what of necessity was involved in the subordination of bishops to their metropolitans, and of metropolitans to patriarchs, from the period when each of these ranks successively grew up in the Church.

This not only appears by what St. Gregory Nazianzen says of St. Cyprian in his xviii. oration,¹ "that he presided not only over the Church of Carthage and Africa, but over all the regions of the west, and over the east and south, and northern parts of the world also;" and, in like manner, of St. Athanasius, "That in being made Bishop of Alexandria he was made bishop of the whole world;" and by what St. Chrysostom says of Eustathius, Patriarch of Antioch, that he was instructed by the Holy Spirit that he was not only to have the care of that Church over which he was set, but of the whole Church throughout the world,² but, to save multiplying instances, the whole is summed up by an eminent Roman Catholic French writer of the 16th century, Simon Vigorius, thus—"When the Western Fathers call the Roman Bishops, Bishops of the Universal Church, they do it from the custom of their Churches, not that they look on them as universal bishops of the whole Church, but in the same sense that the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem are called so, or as they are universal over the Churches under their patriarchate, or that in Ecumenical Councils they preside over the whole Church."³ Keeping this distinction in mind, the student of early ecclesiastical history will find everything on the subject clear and consistent, though without it, Pope Gregory's letters would appear inconsistent and inexplicable.

After all this, what becomes of Dr. Geraghty's boasted title of *Universal Bishop*, which he now has been obliged to substitute for the more high-sounding one of *Universal Hierarchy*, a title which, a month ago, he so confidently asserted had been granted to Pope Leo I. by the Council of Chalcedon, until we exposed the misquotation—a charge from which, we presume, he has found it impossible to extricate himself, as, while alluding to the subject in his present letter, he attempts neither defence nor apology.

CURIOSITIES OF ROMANISM.—II.

In presenting to our readers the specimen of the "curiosities" of the Romish system of religion contained in our last number, we were quite aware of the manner in which the Papal controversialist is accustomed to meet all such objections to his Church, if objections he admits them to be. They are only, he will say, the theories and opinions of canonists and casuists. It was merely *Dens qui thus* wrote and thought. But the opinions of a single divine are not to be taken or treated as matters of faith, or as the voice of the universal Church. Thus, Proteus-like, the Roman advocate eludes the fair consequences derivable from the monstrously absurd disquisitions which abound in such authorized and authenticated teachers as the author just referred to, or even in the pages of "the angelical Doctor" himself. Nevertheless, we still must hold that Church as fully accountable for all such false and absurd

¹ Tom. I. p. 281, Morell's edit. Paris, 1630.

² Oration xxi., id. p. 377. See also St. Basil, Epist. 69, tom. iii., Ben. ed., p. 163, where St. Basil speaks of Athanasius as "having the care of all the Churches, as much as of that which was peculiarly committed to him."

³ Oper. Chrysost. tom. ii., p. 607, Ben. ed. Paris, 1718.

⁴ Opera omnia Simonis Vigorij, Paris, 1683, ad responsionem Syn. Concil. Basil. Comment. p. 37-38.—"Et harum rerum ignari andabamus nostri non advertant, cum Occidentales Patres Pontifices Romanos vocant Universales Ecclesie, id more suorum Ecclesiarum facere, et ea notione, non quod possent totius orbis universales, universales esse Episcopos, sed eadem quæ Constantinopolitanis, Alexandrianis, Antiochenis, Hierosolymitanis, dicuntur universales; aut ut universales Ecclesie quæ sunt sub eorum Patriarchatu; aut quod in Conciliis Ecumenicis totæ Ecclesie præsent."

^a See Stillingfleet's works, vol. iv., p. 408, &c.

¹ "Consecrator meus Joannes vocari Universalis Episcopus conatur. Exclamare compellor ac dicere: O tempora! O mores! Sacerdotes vanitatis sibi nomina expetunt; et novis ac profanis vocabulis gloriantur. Nuncquid ego, hic in re, propriam causam defendo? Nuncquid specialem injuriam video, et non magis causam Omnipotentis Dei, et causam Universalis Ecclesie? Sed abest a cordibus Christianorum nomen illud blasphemum, in quo omnium sacerdotum honor admittitur, dum ab uno sibi dementem arrogatur.—Pep. Gregor. I., lib. iv., ep. xx. opera. tom. ii., p. 748. Ben. Ed.

² "Nullus unquam decessorum meorum hoc tam profano vocabulo uti consensit: quia, videlicet, si unus Patriarcha Universalis dicitur, Patriarcharum nomen ceteris derogatur. Sed abest hoc, abest a Christiana mente, id sibi velle quoniam arripere, unde fratrum suorum honorem imminuere ex quantalibet parte videatur.—Greg. Epist. lib. 5, ep. 43, opera. tom. ii., p. 771.

³ "Tu id Christo, Universalis scilicet Ecclesie capiti, in extremi iudicii ex dictis examine, qui cuncta ejus membra timet conaris Universalis appellatione supponere? Quis, rogo, in hoc tam perverso vocabulo, nisi ille ad imitandum proponitur, qui de peccatis angelorum legionibus secum sociatiter constituit, ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere?"—Lib. v., Ep. 18, tom. ii., p. 742.

⁴ "Ego vero fidenter dico, quia quicquid se Universalium Sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum præcurrit, quia, superbiendo, ceteris præponit."—Lib. vii. epist. 33, t. ii., p. 881. Lib. xiii., Epist. 31, tom. ii., p. 1238.

theology. Let it be ever remembered that she has an apparatus at hand at once and effectually to get rid of those objectionable appendages to her teaching, should such a course be thought desirable. With the "Congregation of the Index" and the "Index Prohibitorius" at her command, the Church of Rome must be held accountable for the entire mass of such theology as that of Dens and Liguori, if not also for a large part of the deluge of villainess and untruth which is daily contaminating society through the popular press. Our dilemma respecting all such publications is this, If they be good and profitable, why disown or cast doubt on their connection with the Church of Rome? If they be evil or absurd, why are they not at once placed in the Index?

We felt, therefore, while culling the curious theological flower from the garden of Dens, on the connection between the use of tobacco and the validity of one of the sacraments of the Church, that we were doing nothing but what was defensible and fair. But there is another class of documents which affords specimens of theology quite as extraordinary as any which could possibly be extracted from the writings of individual teachers in the Church of Rome, and with this difference, that their intimate connection with, or relation to, that Church is even still more immediate and indisputable. We allude to such compositions as the *Missale*, the *Breviarium*, the *Rituale*, and the *Pontificale Romanum*, to mention no others. These volumes stand related to the Church of Rome as the Book of Common Prayer to the United Church of England and Ireland; and as they exhibit the authoritative doctrine and practice of the Papacy in such plain and unmistakable colours, and, besides, may not be so easy of access to certain of our readers as ourselves, we design, from time to time, to give some selections from them, which will, unless we greatly err, strikingly illustrate the curiosities which are to be found in that system.

We shall commence with the *Roman Ritual*. The copy before us is of date 1850, from the press at Mechlin, and with the imprimatur of "Engelbertus," Cardinal Archbishop of that city. It is only necessary to add, as regards the authoritative nature of the volume in question, that (as our learned readers will already know) it was first edited by Pope Pius V., enlarged and revised by Benedict XIV., and has received the successive sanction of every Pontiff from the last-named Pope to the reigning one. Our present extract from the Ritual will contain some notice of the form therein prescribed for the Sacrament of Baptism.

In the prefatory observations, or rubrics, which accompany the prescribed form of Baptism certain matters are stated which come under the head of curious. Thus, whereas we are told that the matter, form, and minister of this sacrament are of divine institution, and absolutely necessary (de jure divino et absolute necessaria), other additions to it, here laid down, are of "apostolic and most ancient tradition." This being premised and borne in mind, our readers will be pleased, as we proceed, to tax their recollections with the *when* and the *how* the ceremonies which we shall notice were apostolically ordained.

Under the heading, "*De ministro Baptismi*,"—the proper minister—we are told that, although the parish priest, or his deputy, is the fittest person to administer the ordinance, yet, in a case of urgency, as of life or death, either of an infant or adult, it may lawfully be administered by any person and in any language (Latin or vernacular), "*cleric or layman, an excommunicated person, believer or unbeliever, Catholic or heretic, man or woman*," provided only that the form and intention be preserved. Hence, we are told that it is the duty of the parish priest to give proper instructions to all the faithful as to the mode of baptizing, and especially nurse tenders, or accoucheurs (*obstetrices*).

The gross indecency which follows this clause may be found in the foot note, locked up in the dead language of the original. We shall not pollute our pages by transcribing it in an English version.

Now, the design of Rome in this accommodating permission may not be, at first sight, apparent; but it is evident to any reflecting mind that her net is thus broadly and freely cast by many and by every hand, male and female, faithful and heretic alike, for the purpose of enclosing the greater multitude. She claims jurisdiction, be it remembered, over all the baptized. Hence the inexpediency, to say the least, of admitting Romish emissaries to the beds of the sick and dying, or to the care of infants. These are some of the means whereby the dominion of that Church is spread, "*per fas et nefas*."

Before, however, the priest can perform this rite properly he must have his implements; the workman must have his tools; and we are accordingly furnished with a list of these, which we shall transcribe in order, as an ecclesiastical curiosity:—(Page 13, &c.)

1. Vessels of holy oil.

2. A vessel with blessed salt.

3. A vessel or silver spoon (or else one made of some other shining metal), for pouring the water on the head

of the baptized. This vessel or spoon must never be used for any other purpose.

4. A basin for receiving the water which flows off the head of the baptized.

5. A piece of cotton, or silk, or something of the sort, for wiping the parts anointed.

6. Two stoles, one violet coloured, the other white.

7. Bread pith, for wiping the priest's fingers when he washes his hands.

8. A basin for the above purpose.

9. A white garment, like a little cloak, or a little white hood, to be put on the infant's head.

10. A wax candle or taper, to be handed, lighted, to the baptized.

11. The book of forms, viz., the Ritual.

12. The registry for the baptism.

Here is an inventory of, at least, a dozen articles, some of them strange enough in all conscience; but what is noticeable and really curious is, that in the midst of all this particularity the Church of Rome has actually forgotten to make direct mention of the element of water itself. It is alluded to when the basin is mentioned, and in the prescribed form its presence is supposed; but it is passing strange that while salt, and oil, and basins, and stoles, and even saliva itself (p. 20), are all specified, water, which is alone essential, is omitted!

We pass to a consideration of the mode of using this strange farrago of utensils with a single observation. Can it be for a moment believed that all this is really derived from Apostolical tradition? Will it be seriously asserted that the immediate followers of our Lord carried about with them such instruments and appliances as these? What trace of such a state of things have we in the New Testament? Had St. Paul silver spoons, jugs, basins, holy oil, holy salt, or bread pith when he baptized the jailer and his household at Philippi? Yet the Church of Rome would have us believe that all this baptismal paraphernalia is not only useful and edifying, but apostolical!

Such are some of the curiosities of the preparation. In our next we shall probably consider the mode of administering the ordinance itself.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters meant for publication should be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street, and the real name and address given, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

We earnestly request our correspondents, both Protestants and Roman Catholics, to limit the length of their communications, when possible, and not in any case to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JULY 15, 1858.

THE *Tablet* of June 19 contains an "Encyclical" letter of our holy Father Pope Pius IX. to all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and other ordinaries of the places in communication with the Apostolic See." This letter is dated the 3rd of May, 1858.

Such a letter is always deserving of attention. If we learn nothing else from it, we learn the practical teaching of the Church of Rome, from the highest speaking authority.

We are aware that a large number of learned Roman Catholics, at least in times past, have denied that such a letter from the Pope to all the Bishops of his communion is infallible. Their doctrine is, that the Pope is not infallible without a General Council. Probably the Roman Catholics who now hold this opinion are fewer than they were a hundred years ago. All who hold that the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary has been infallibly decided, must needs hold that the Pope is infallible without a General Council.

If any of our readers think that this letter of the Pope is not infallible, we think them right; but we ask them to consider further how ridiculous it is to speak of a Church having the advantage of infallible direction in matters of faith, or how such supposed direction can secure unity of

faith, when such letters are accepted by one party in the Church of Rome as infallible, and rejected by another party as fallible. Truly, we think Roman Catholics ought to settle this among themselves, before they say any more of differences of opinion among Protestants.

But, at least, we may say that such letters are the highest available authority that the Roman Catholic world now has, or has had since the Council of Trent (300 years ago), for determining what her doctrine and teaching really is; and it is to be observed that this "Encyclical letter" is not from the Pope alone, but is issued by him with the advice and assistance of "our Venerable Brothers, the Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, who compose the congregation charged with causing to be respected, and with interpreting, the decrees of the Council of Trent." This is no private letter of the Pope; it is the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*, with the assistance of the advisers constituted for him by the Church of Rome.

The "Encyclical letter" begins with the death of Christ for our salvation, and His ascension into heaven, and His purpose "to dwell, meanwhile, with us in the august sacrament of His body and of His blood." The letter goes on then to "the Priesthood;"—"Declaring Himself the Eternal Priest according to the order of Melchizedec, He has instituted in perpetuity his Priesthood in the Catholic Church"

We have here, under the authority of the Pope and the Congregation of Cardinals, the great artifice and deceit of the Church of Rome about the priesthood. "*Hiereus*" is the Greek word for a priest who sacrifices; under the gospel dispensation that word is applied to Christ,^b and to Christ only. Christ and His Apostles have by their example and authority forbidden us to apply that word to the minister, of Christ, except in that figurative sense in which it may be applied to all Christians.^c The Holy Scriptures never call Christ's minister "*Hiereus*." The Apostles adopted for the ministers of Christ whom they ordained a totally different title, in use among the Jews—"Presbyteros," which title did not imply the power of offering sacrifice. Thus the Apostles pointed out to the Church that Christ's ministers are not to be called "Priest" in the sense in which Christ is called priest—that their priesthood is not of the same kind as His—and that the difference consists, and is expressed, in the great truth, that He offered sacrifice, and they do not. The Pope confounds this great distinction, made by the Apostles, and is careful to call Christ and His ministers "Priests," by the same title, and in the same sense of offering sacrifice.

The English language does not afford two words which forcibly express the difference between "*Hiereus*" and "*Presbyteros*." The Church of England and Ireland calls Christ's ministers "Priests," because "Priest" or "Pres" is really the Saxon contraction of "*Presbyter*." The Church of England and Ireland also calls Christ a "Priest," because the English language has no higher English word for "*Hiereus*;" but the Church of England and Ireland makes it plain to all that Christ only offered sacrifice, and that His ministers do not; thus plainly showing forth, as far as the English language admits, the forcible contrast marked by the inspired writers between Christ and His Apostles in this respect.

Pope Pius IX. wrote his letter, not in English, but in Latin. The Latin language does afford two different terms expressive of "*Hiereus*" and "*Presbyteros*;" but the Pope would not use different words, but applies the same word to the priesthood of Christ and His ministers, for the purpose of making men think that the priesthood of Christ and His ministers is the same in its

^a *De Baptizandis parulis*.—"Nemo in utero matris clausus baptizari debet. Sed si infans caput emerit, et periculum mortis imminet, baptizetur in capite at al aliud membrum emerit, quod vitalem indicet motum, in illo, si periculum impendat, baptizetur," &c.—Page 10.

^a "Encyclical" means a circular letter; that is, a letter of which many copies are sent to numbers of persons.

^b Heb. v. 6; vii., 15, 17, 21, 24.

^c 1 Peter ii. 5, 9. Rev. i. 6.